

## REMARKS

This paper is response to a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on February 8, 2006, which was responsive to an Office Action mailed December 22, 2005. Previously, claims 22-40 were pending. After amending claims 34 and 35, claims 22-40 remain pending.

Section 3 of the Office Action states that claims 22-33 have been allowed, based upon the limitation of an air gap cavity between the prism and polarizer surfaces, surrounded by an adhesive.

Section 4 of the Office Action states that claim 34 was not allowed because it lacked the above-mentioned patentable limitation.

In Section 8 of the Office Action claims 34 and 39-40 have been rejected as anticipated by Ito et al. ("Ito"; US Pub. 2003/0179345). In response, claim 34 has been amended to recite that the air cavity is "surrounded by an adhesive". Since claim 34 includes a limitation found patentable by the Examiner, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34, and dependent claims 39-40, are now allowable.

In Section 9 of the Office Action claims 34-35, 37, and 39-40 have been rejected as anticipated by Matsuda (US 5,703,861). As noted above, claim 34 has been amended to recite that the air cavity is "surrounded by an adhesive". Since claim 34 includes a patentable limitation, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34-35, 37, and 39-40, are now allowable.

In Section 11 of the Office Action, claim 36 has been rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Matsuda, in view of Yamada et al. ("Yamada"; US 6,013,339) and Ishiwatari (JP 11007027). As noted above, claim 34 has been amended to recite that the air cavity is

"surrounded by an adhesive". Since claim 34 includes a patentable limitation, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36, dependent from claim 34, is now allowable.

In Section 12 of the Office Action, claim 38 has been rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Matsuda. As noted above, claim 34 has been amended to recite that the air cavity is "surrounded by an adhesive". Since claim 34 includes a patentable limitation, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 38, dependent from claim 34, is now allowable.


Section 13 of the Office Action states that claims 22-33 have been allowed.

Section 14 of the Office Action states the reasons for allowance. Note, the Applicant neither expressly agrees nor disagrees with the states reasons for allowance.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/13/2006

  
Gerald Maliszewski  
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286  
P.O. Box 270829  
San Diego, CA 92198-2829  
Telephone: (858) 451-9950  
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869  
gerry@ipatentit.net